

**REMARKS**

The Office Action sets forth a requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 121 imposing a Requirement for Election of Species among the following alleged species of the claimed invention:

- 1<sup>st</sup> Species: Fig. 6
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Species: Fig. 9
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Species: Fig. 11
- 4<sup>th</sup> Species: Fig. 13
- 5<sup>th</sup> Species: Fig. 15
- 6<sup>th</sup> Species: Fig. 17
- 7<sup>th</sup> Species: Fig. 19
- 8th Species: Fig. 20
- 9th Species: Fig. 21
- 10th Species: Fig. 22.

The examiner has noted, and Applicant agrees, that claim 1 is currently generic to all Species.

By this response, Applicant elects the 4<sup>th</sup> Species (Fig. 13), with traverse. Claim 1 is generic to all species and newly added claim 9 is sub-generic to the species of Figs. 11, 13, 15 and 17. Newly added claim 10 reads on the elected species.

However, as set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that at least claims 4 and 6 should also be examined, consonant with the current election.

Each of the current claims includes a camera configuration which processed pixel information differently according to different modes which can be selected. Accordingly,

Application No. 09/817,545  
Amendment and Response to Election of Species  
Requirement dated January 20, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 20, 2004

each independent claim necessarily involves more than one mode of operation. The “species” identified by the examiner, however, each only correspond to one mode of processing. Thus, none of the species proposed by the Examiner corresponds to any of the original claims, as a whole.

Accordingly, while Applicant has identified an elected species as required (the species corresponding to Fig. 13) and have identified a claim which corresponds to this species, Applicant respectfully submit that the restriction is not appropriate given the nature of the invention and should therefore be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

Wherefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

This Amendment does not increase the number of independent claims, increases the total number of claims by 2 from 8 to 10, and does not present any multiple dependency claims. Any fee required by this document other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.


Any other fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time and any other fee required by this document pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee,

Application No. 09/817,545  
Amendment and Response to Election of Species  
Requirement dated January 20, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 20, 2004

and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's  
Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Tung T. Nguyen  
Registration No. 42,935  
Attorney for Applicants

TNT/TTN:bar  
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP  
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Direct: (214) 981-3478  
Main: (214) 981-3300  
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400  
January 20, 2005